

☐ SECRET

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT		CONTRACT NO. <u> </u>	TASK NO. <u> </u>		
TO: <div style="border:1px solid black; width:150px; height:20px; margin:5px 0;"></div>		25X1			
		16 November 1968 (If final, so state)			
		ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE <u> </u>			
NAME OF CONTRACTOR		15 September 1969			
Type of Model or Prototype <u>Coming Glass Works</u>					
THE FOLLOWING ARE THE RESULTS OF THE INSPECTION: <u>Improved Rear Projection Screen</u> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.			
PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - <u>X</u>					
PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - <u>10%</u> <u>Unknown</u>					
HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)					
HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)					
INCENTIVES					
IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO IF YES, CHECK TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> COST <input type="checkbox"/> AWARD FEE <input type="checkbox"/> PERFORMANCE <input type="checkbox"/> DELIVERY		NOTE: USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS. FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.			
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR					
1. <input type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING 4. <input type="checkbox"/> ABOVE AVERAGE 7. <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY 2. <input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT 5. <input type="checkbox"/> AVERAGE 3. <input type="checkbox"/> VERY GOOD 6. <input type="checkbox"/> MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE					
IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.					
RECOMMENDED ACTION					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED <input type="checkbox"/> WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE <input type="checkbox"/> CLOSE OUT <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify)					
IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:					
ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		
DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR					
4 November 1968			DIVISION		
25X1					

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET (12-36)

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM

☐ FINAL

On 4 November 1968, the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (Inspector) visited the Contractor's plant in Raleigh, North Carolina to conduct the required periodic inspection. Contractor's representatives present during this visit were [redacted]

25X1
25X1

As the result of a request made by the Contractor (re: Corning ltr dtd 30 July 1968), approval was given for a change in emphasis (re: Contracting Officer's ltr dtd 9 September 1968) under which the major effort of the current program would be devoted toward the development of a lenticular screen. It was agreed that some work on scattering screens would also be performed.

During the above referenced visit, [redacted] noted that although the present contract called for production of sufficient sheets of material to cover a 30" X 30" aperture, the anticipated production cost of such a large lenticular screen would exceed the funds available under the present contract. Therefore, it was noted that production of small samples (approximately 5" X 7") only could be made.

25X1

[redacted] suggested that the best course of action would be the optimum development of the three best particle screens produced as samples under the previous contract, subjective testing of 12" X 15" pieces of these three screens by the sponsor and, based on these tests, final fabrication of a 30" X 30" screen of the best material. Thus, a screen having characteristics equal to or better than those currently available commercially would be realized. In addition, prosecution of the effort to produce a small lenticular screen with still better characteristics would be made.

25X1

The inspector advised the Corning representatives that since an "overrun" would be completely unacceptable and the inherent fabrication difficulties of a lenticular screen of large dimensions was fully appreciated, [redacted] recommendation for the best course of action would be given careful consideration and an opinion rendered no later than 15 November 1968.

25X1

[redacted] noted that additional Human Factors data would be required relative to the operator/screen orientation since it might be possible to tailor the screen to give ideal directional characteristics which would, in turn, allow improvement of certain of the other specified characteristics.

25X1

To satisfy this requirement, the inspector is planning a visit to the Corning plant during the week of 11 November 1968 and will have a Human Factors expert accompany him.

Attention of the Contractor was invited to the fact that the contract called for monthly reports in accordance with our Specification No. DB-1001 and that only one such report had been received since the contract was signed in July 1968. Assurance was given that future reports would be submitted as specified.

Relative to the "performance of the contractor" rating listed on the obverse of this report, the inspector is not convinced that suitable effort was expended on this contract since his last visit on 30 July 1968.* Changes in Contractor personnel and delays in obtaining clearances are undoubtedly contributing factors. However, a lack of internal direction on the part of the Contractor is considered to be the main cause for lack of progress. This situation should improve with the active participation of [redacted] now that he has been suitably cleared.

25X1
25X1

The inspector has discussed this point with [redacted] In view of the past "above average" performance of this Contractor, it is the opinion of the inspector that this is a transient problem and will be rectified within the next reporting period. It is, therefore, recommended that the Contractor be allowed to continue as programmed. More frequent visits by the inspector will be made to insure that suitable progress is forthcoming.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☒ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

- * **NOTE:** The delay between visits (30 July - 4 November) by the inspector was occasioned by an extended illness.

CONFIDENTIAL